

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 24, 42, 46, 48, and 50-57 have been amended and claims 2, 9 and 49 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 3-8, 10-48 and 50-57 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Final Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13-26, 29, 31-49, 51 and 53-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ballantyne et al. (U.S. Patent 6,687,873) (hereinafter “Ballantyne”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

Regarding claim 1, Ballantyne does disclose a service in a distributed computing environment generating results data for a client in the distributed computing environment; and accessing a presentation schema in the distributed computing environment, wherein the presentation schema is provided by the service.

Ballantyne discloses a system that modifies a legacy computer system to output data in XML format. Ballantyne’s system includes a code generation system that allows analysis of legacy program applications and generation of modified legacy program applications. After modification, the legacy applications are able to directly output syntactically correct XML data. (see, Ballantyne, column 6, lines 15-26). However, Ballantyne does not disclose a service that both generates results data for a client and provides the presentation schema. Instead, Ballantyne teaches that modeling engine 28 includes a modeling/mapping graphical user interface 30 that allows programmers to create or modify an XML schema (Ballantyne, column 6, lines 48-65). However, since Modeling engine 28 does not generate results data for a client in a distributed computing system, Ballantyne clearly fails to anticipate *a service* in a distributed computing environment *generating results data for a client* in the distributed computing

environment; and accessing a presentation schema in the distributed computing environment, wherein the presentation schema is provided by the service.

Applicants remind the Examiner that anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. M.P.E.P 2131; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

For at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 1 is clearly not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Similar arguments apply in regard to independent claims 24, 42, 46 and 48.

Regarding claim 6, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ballantyne fails to disclose wherein generating the results data comprises the service storing the results data on a results space in the distributed computing environment. The Examiner fails to cite any portion of Ballantyne. Instead, the Examiner merely states, "the results data would be outputted to a space in a computing environment". However, Ballantyne fails to mention anything regarding a service storing the results data on a results space. Without any supporting passage from Ballantyne's teachings, the Examiner's rejection of claim 6 amounts to nothing more than the Examiner's own speculation regarding Ballantyne's system. In fact, Ballantyne fails to teach anything regarding a service storing results data on a results space. Instead, Ballantyne teaches that legacy applications may be modified to directly output data in XML format.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 6 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 7, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ballantyne fails to disclose wherein accessing results data for a client in the distributed computing

environment comprises accessing the results data from the results space. The Examiner fails to cite any portion of Ballantyne. Instead, the Examiner merely states (as with claim 6, discussed above), “the results data would be outputted to a space in a computing environment.” However, Ballantyne fails to mention anything regarding a service storing the results data on a results space and further fails to mention anything about access the results data from a results space. Without any supporting passage from Ballantyne’s teachings, the Examiner’s rejection of claim 6 amounts to nothing more than the Examiner’s own speculation regarding Ballantyne’s system. In fact, Ballantyne fails to teach anything regarding storing or accessing results data on a results space. Instead, Ballantyne teaches that legacy applications may be modified to directly output data in XML format.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 7 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 103(a) Rejections:

The Final Office Action rejected claims 8, 10, 27, 28 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 8, 10, 27, 28 and 50 for at least the reasons presented above regarding their respective independent claims.

Further regarding claim 8 and contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Ballantyne fails to teach or suggest providing a results advertisement for the results data on the results space, wherein the results advertisement includes information for enabling access of the results data. The Examiner cites column 17 of Ballantyne and argues that the XML formatted output of modified legacy applications “comprise invoices, billing statements, or any other type of report data including advertisement.” The Examiner further states, “[a]lthough Ballantyne does not state ‘advertisements’, the term ‘report data’ could comprise an advertisement.” However, claim 8 is not referring to traditional

advertising content, but instead refers to a *results advertisement* that includes information for enabling access of the results data. Ballantyne does not teach or suggest anything regarding such a results advertisement that includes information for enabling access of the results data. Furthermore, the Examiner is referring to traditional advertising that may be part of the results data, not an advertisement *for the results data*, wherein the advertisement includes information for enabling access of the results data. The term “advertisement” is not used in the claims to mean a commercial or marketing advertisement. Instead, advertisement is defined in this claim as an advertisement *for the results data* that includes information for enabling access of the results data.

The Examiner further argues that it would have been obvious to produce advertisements as “result data” since an XML schema can be used to produce XML formatted data. Once again, the Examiner is referring to including traditional advertising content in the output from Ballantyne’s modified legacy applications. Such traditional advertising has nothing to do with a results advertisement including information for enabling access of results data.

Furthermore, Ballantyne fails to teach or suggest accessing the results data from the results space in accordance with the results advertisement. **The Examiner has completely ignored this limitation of claim 8.**

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 8 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Remarks similar to those above regarding claim 8 also apply to claim 27.

Further regarding claim 10, contrary to the Examiner’s contention, Ballantyne fails to teach or suggest wherein the presentation schema is comprised in a presentation schema advertisement comprised on a storage device in the distributed computing environment, wherein the storage device is operable to store a plurality of presentation schema advertisements, and wherein accessing the presentation schema comprises access the presentation schema advertisement from the storage device through a space service.

The Examiner cites column 17 and argues that Ballantyne teaches providing results data in XML format and that XML data may comprise “invoices, billing statements, or any other type of report data including advertisement.” The Examiner further argues, “[a]lthough Ballantyne does not state ‘advertisements’, the term ‘report data’ could comprise an advertisement. However, as noted above regarding claim 8, the Examiner is referring to traditional advertising content, which has nothing to do with a presentation schema advertisement.

Additionally, even if Ballantyne’s XML output included a presentation schema advertisement (which Applicants maintain it does not) the Examiner has failed to show where Ballantyne teaches or suggests that such an advertisement could be used to generate the XML output (which the Examiner equates to presenting results data in accordance with a presentation schema). Following the Examiner’s line of reasoning, one of Ballantyne’s modified legacy applications would have to generate XML output that includes a presentation schema advertisement (even though Ballantyne doesn’t teach this) and access a schema via that presentation schema advertisement in order to generate the XML output (that was already output and included the schema advertisement) in accordance with the schema. Such an interpretation cannot be correct.

Furthermore, the Examiner has not mentioned or cited any portion of Ballantyne that teaches or suggests a presentation schema advertisement comprised on a storage device, wherein the storage device is operable to store a plurality of presentation schema advertisements. Nor does the Examiner mention or cite any portion of Ballantyne that teaches or suggests wherein accessing the presentation schema comprises access the presentation schema advertisement from the space device through a space service.

Thus, in light of the above remarks, Applicants assert that the rejection of claim 10 is not supported by the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Remarks similar to those above regarding claim 10 also apply to claims 28 and 50.

The Final Office Action rejected claims 12, 30 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne in view of Sravanapudi et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0049603) (hereinafter “Sravanapudi”). Applicants submit that claims 12, 30 and 52 are patentable for at least the reasons given above regarding their respective independent claims.

In regard to all the rejections, Applicants also assert that the rejections of numerous ones of the dependent claims are further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejections of each of the independent claims have been shown to be improper, a further discussion of the rejections of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION


Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-57700/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☒ Request for Continued Examination
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: April 25, 2005